

Remarks

Claims 2-23 are pending. Claims 2-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen (Pub. US 2002/0071557).

Nguyen discloses a network of gaming machines, that when they want to receive payment, they encrypt a message, initiate communication with a server and transmit it to the server. The server, only upon receipt of the message, then transmits the payment to the gaming machine. This is disclosed in Nguyen as follows.

Paragraph 0064, lines 12-14, "Information from one or more gaming transactions may be stored in a non-volatile memory *located on the gaming machine*;" lines 21-24, "In 515, the symmetric encryption key may be asymmetrically encrypted using a public key that was previously exchanged *between the gaming machine and the recipient of the message*."

Paragraph 0065, lines 1-5, "*In 518, the gaming machine generates a message containing the symmetrically encrypted gaming transaction data and the asymmetrically encrypted symmetric encryption key using a communication protocol of some type such as TCP/IP.*"

Paragraph 0066, lines 9-11, "*In 525, the gaming machine sends the message generated in 518 to a remote site such a[s] game license server, a report server of some other device via the local ISP.*"

Therefore, Nguyen discloses a network in which a gaming machine generates a message, makes connection with a server through an ISP, if that connection is not already there (see paragraph 0066), encrypts the message and transmits it to the server. The server only communicates with the gaming machine upon the gaming machines initiation.

In contrast, the claims 2, 10 and 21, as amended, require that the server initiate contact with the gaming machine by the encrypted message. This is because the server maintains the bonus pool and the server decides when and who gets payment. In Nguyen, the

gaming machine decides when the player gets paid. In the instant application, the bonus server determines which gaming machine gets paid and how much.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2, 10 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 2-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 11-19 depend from claim 10 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 11-19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 22-23 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of Weiss et al. (US Patent No. 6,071,190).

As discussed above, Nguyen does not teach all of the elements of claim 10, much less the further limitation of claim 20. The addition of Weiss does not overcome that deficiency. In addition, the definition of the 'second processing area' in Weiss as being a second node is not clear from the Office Action, and it is believed that the interpretation is not correct. It is

therefore submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613